UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,417	03/12/2004	Paul A. Krieg	20825-0004	6904
Kathryn H. Wade, Ph.D. SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP			EXAMINER	
			BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE	
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309-3996			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/799,417	KRIEG, PAUL A.				
Examiner-initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	LYNN BRISTOL	1643				
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>pen</u>	ding				
(1) <u>LYNN BRISTOL</u> .	(3) <u>Allan Robins</u> .					
(2) <u>Wm. Warren</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: <u>5 February 2010</u>	Time: <u>9:00 AM</u>					
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:						
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:  proposed draft claim set						
Claims discussed:  proposed draft claim set						
Prior art documents discussed: proposed draft claim set						
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet						
Part III.						
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>						
/Lynn Bristol/ Primary Examiner (A <sub>I</sub>	oplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)				

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Telephone message re: allowed European claims drawn to method per se (Claim 1) are performed in vitro and not in vivo as proposed in draft claim set; recitation in proposed draft Claim 1 as explantion of angiogenesis is acknowlegded, however, claims do not meet written description for the genus of functionalized antibodies having all of the following properties: i) binding apelin in vivo; ii) inhibiting angiogenesis in vivo; iii) mediating anti-angiogenesis for any kind of angiogenesis in any human subject; and iv) having the functional properties of claims 2-4.